UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Two Men of Mexico - - *Harold P. Marley*

Mexican Labor Eyes the Good Neighbor - - - - - - - *Brent Dow Allinson*

Some Impressions Gathered in Mexico - *E. G.*

Painting the Town - - - *Miriam Ziony*

The Study Table

VOLUME CXXIII NUMBER 9

Chicago, July 3, 1939

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES F. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 131
Jottings—J. H. H. 133

ARTICLES—
Two Men of Mexico—HAROLD P. MARLEY 134
Mexican Labor Eyes the Good Neighbor—BRENT DOW ALLINSON 135
Some Impressions Gathered in Mexico—E. G. 137
Painting the Town—MIRIAM ZIONY 140

POETRY—
The Common Man Speaking—HOMER LEWIS SHEFFER 139
Rise, Ye Men—THOMAS CURTIS CLARK 143

THE STUDY TABLE—
The Bible and the Common Man—CHARLES A. HAWLEY 143

CORRESPONDENCE—
Roosevelt and the Third Term—VICTOR S. YARROS 144
Questions "Return to Jesus"—CARL PETERSON 144

THE FIELD—
Coöperation for Recovery 130

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Coöperation for Recovery

A plea for economic coöperation was recently issued by an important group of American clergymen. It called for "a wisely conceived guidance of economic life, [which] need not mean a dictatorial state. Neglect to guide and direct the economic system will mean totalitarianism by default."

The joint statement pointed out that the depression had "held America in its grip for nine years"; that "millions are still jobless"; that, "in terms of economic life, our tragedy is due to failure to distribute the income of our production widely enough to enable us to end poverty in the United States."

"From a moral and religious standpoint," the statement added, "the cause of our tragedy is our refusal to govern our lives in accordance with the old truth that we are all persons possessed of immeasurable dignity, struggling through life together as brothers, under one God, toward the one goal."

After adding that "working and ownership should exist for the good of each and the good of all," the joint statement continued:

"A new spirit is coming over employers' associations. The labor movement, on its part, is exercising more responsibility for the efficient operation of industry than is generally known, and is aiming at coöperation with the owners for the purpose of guiding incomes and prices in a new and better way.

"We need to direct economic life, but the direction should be undertaken first of all and to the very limits of the possibilities by the people, democratically organized around their own work and ownership.

"The greatest burden and control should rest on the people freely organized as now, in employers' associations and labor unions, in farmers' marketing coöperatives and in associations of the professions, and upon them so federated by industry councils that they can see their own occupation squarely in the whole picture of economic life.

"Government leadership can go far to lead them when they are thus organized. The consumers themselves should organize in coöperatives.

"The fundamental mistake of the NRA should never be repeated. The NRA did not provide for inter-industry coöperation. It did not give effective representation to consumers. It left employes and their unions almost entirely out.

"It is impossible to preserve our essential democratic, political life without some form of economic democracy; but from the experience of other countries, we fear that a tendency toward governmental control of economic life will produce totalitarianism here.

"In the face of this dilemma, we are encouraged to recommend this democratic procedure we have suggested not only because it appears to be the sole hope of preserving our democracy but

(Continued on page 144)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXIII MONDAY, JULY 3, 1939 No. 9

DEMOCRACY

. . . laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. . . . I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education.

—THOMAS JEFFERSON.

FOUR GEORGES

Independence Day (July 4th) comes this year at a time when America and England were never perhaps more closely bound in mutual esteem and good feeling. Who could have imagined that, in a period of 163 years, the drama of four Georges could have unfolded into such a denouement of amity? St. George, as the presiding genius of the play, gives the enduring note of idealism and courage. Then, in the Revolution, come George III and George Washington, confronting one another in implacable conflict. Now, five generations later, comes a George VI to seal a friendship of two peoples long estranged in bitter enmity, yet ever fostering the same culture and representing the same great ideals of liberty and justice. America today is as independent of foreign sovereignty and influence as she ever was—the Declaration is a document destined to endure not only in letter but in spirit! Once the nation was betrayed—in 1917-18, she was ensnared into that struggle of contending imperialisms which has for centuries made Europe the bloody battleground not of civilization against barbarism, but of rival militaristic systems of conquest and plunder. Not again shall we be misled, though the same balances of power are again being formed in Europe for the renewal of the same struggle. But deeper than all the facts of governments and empires lies the reality of *peoples*—of humble men and women, millions of them, in all nations and of all races and religions, reaching out eagerly, almost desperately, to one another in search of peace and brotherhood. There can be no ending of the world's ills, no saving even of its life, except as peoples absorb or overcome governments, and become themselves one in spirit and in truth. It is because the peoples of England and America, of the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States, seem to be accomplishing this spiritual unity, that mankind at this hour may not be utterly without hope. For the same reason may the recent visit of George VI to these shores be regarded as of permanent and abiding significance.

THE ROYAL VISIT: THE PERSONAL SIDE

This visit of their Britannic Majesties, King George VI and his consort Queen Elizabeth, was an ideally happy event which reminds one in these dark days of Shakespeare's "little candle" which shed its beams so far "in a naughty world." On the personal side, the royal visit was altogether delightful. On the one hand, the President of the United States and Mrs. Roosevelt were perfect in their roles as host and hostess. The President's extraordinary charm and cordiality combined with his wife's ease, grace, and efficiency to provide a flawless reception for their guests. One thinks, almost with shuddering, of how different it all would have been in this regard had the King and Queen visited us in earlier years. Equally delightful were the guests received at the White House. George VI seems to be a young man endowed with the dignity befitting his historically great office, and also with the simplicity of sincere and noble manhood. As for his Queen, it is long since such beauty has captivated a nation. Elizabeth seems too good to be true —a queen of romance come miraculously to life in a prosaic and often dreadful world! Equally delightful and heartening was the demeanor of the people who, by the millions, in Washington and New York, joined with their official representatives in giving greeting to the royal visitors to these shores. We searched the newspapers in vain for record of a single untoward episode. Of course, the vulgar Congressman was inevitable, as well as the flippant shouts of occasional sightseers who provide the due proportion of exhibitionists in any crowd of people gathered on a curious and exciting occasion. But incidents of this description seemed in a way to fit into the perfect spontaneity, naturalness, and good feeling which characterized the democratic multitudes that filled the public squares, crowded the streets and avenues, and lined the country highways wherever the visitors passed by. There were those who worried about what might happen. The worries were needless. From beginning to end,

it was an idyllic event—an almost immeasurable relief for a few blessed hours from the tragedies and terrors, the despairs and desperations which have for months been filling the mind of the world.

THE ROYAL VISIT: THE POLITICAL SIDE

It would be foolish, however, to allow our enthusiasm over the personal aspects of the royal visit to obscure the political aspects. Important is it to remember, especially now that our visitors have returned to their native kingdom, that the coming of George and Elizabeth to America was one scene in the great drama of power politics now fatefully unfolding on the world's great stage. The visit to the United States, in other words, like the visit to Canada, was carefully planned by statesmen who knew exactly what they were doing, for a purpose which they clearly understood. Our western world is now engaged in lining up on the two sides of a battle-front which threatens at any time to burst forth into the consuming flame of the next world war. Great Britain, ready still for appeasement, since appeasement with Germany can secure for her what even the most triumphant war would only place in dreadful jeopardy, nonetheless anticipates the imminence of another conflict of arms, and is seeking feverishly therefore to organize that balance of power which may bring her victory. Important in that balance on her side is Soviet Russia, but more important still is America. Though it be vain for England to expect the active participation of this country in the next war, it is by no means vain to expect the sympathetic good will and support of this democratic nation, itself an imponderable which might well turn the scales of victory or defeat. The royal visit, therefore, was plainly a bid on the part of the Empire for American friendship when or if the next war comes—and a bid welcomed by the President whose ambition to play a decisive role in impending international affairs is utterly unconcealed. The fortunate part of this political aspect of royal procession, which might well be so sinister, is its perfect openness. We know what's going on and need not therefore be deceived. Personally we feel no displeasure that the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States of America should be drawing ever closer together in amity and concord. On the contrary, as we have said above, we can only rejoice that these two great powers are learning to live together in peace, and thus to banish war as between themselves from so large a portion of the earth's surface. But there remains the menace of empire, and more than ever we should be on our guard that this country, which can more truly serve the cause of democracy inside her own borders than anywhere without, be not dragged again into another world war which can end only in disaster for our western civilization.

THE REICH AND THE SOVIETS

> "It is increasingly observed that the Nazis are driving or drifting towards complete socialization of industry, as in Russia. Thus it is true that both have set upon the same tool for the accomplishment of a purpose. But in Germany the goal or purpose is asserted today as strenuously as ever to be the welfare or exaltation of the State, while in Russia the goal is still claimed to be the welfare or exaltation of the masses."

Where, now, do you suppose we found this statement? In some radical, or even liberal, publication? Not a bit of it! This exceedingly shrewd and accurate comment upon a strangely confused situation we ran across in an "Economic Letter," one of these weekly newssheets put out by a professional financial advisor for the guidance of investors and businessmen. It is a rather amazing analysis to come from such a source. It is true that there are growing similarities between the Reich and the Soviets. Both countries are of the totalitarian type of government. Both are to be reckoned as dictatorships. Both are headed by individual rulers of absolute and supreme power. Both deny all exercise of civil liberties, and suppress all expression of democratic sentiment. Both absorb all industrial activity in the state, and maintain what is accurately to be described as State Socialism. *But*—and this is a big but!—in Germany the whole end and aim of public action is exploitation of the masses, whereas in Russia this end and aim is the service of the masses in all that makes for economic welfare. The underlying philosophies of Naziism and Communism, in other words, are different. The one is a fanatical emotionalism directed to a barbaric past, while the other is a hard-headed and frequently brutal ideology directed, at least in faith and hope, to a utopian future. All this is important, as affecting such a question, for example, as that involving Russia's choice as between Britain and Germany in the present European line-up. There is something essentially ridiculous in the idea of the Soviets joining with Britain and France in a war to make the world safe for democracy. But in a much more fundamental sense it is ridiculous to imagine the Soviets clasping hands with the Reich in any impending war. The whole international situation is a mess, with little logic and less justice anywhere. It's the old, hateful imperialism at work again, with Russia pretty much outside the breastworks.

FATHER COUGHLIN AND THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

The meanness and menace of Father Coughlin, the despicable demagogy of this loathsome priest, are facts plain for all to see. We join with anybody anywhere in denunciation of the most disgusting and dangerous man who has appeared in American life for more than a generation. But we cannot join with those who identify Father Coughlin with the livery of the Church which he disgraces, and count him as evi-

dence of the wickedness of Rome. To blame Roman Catholicism for Coughlin seems to us to be as unjust as to blame Protestantism for the Reverend Gerald Smith. If we do the one, why should we not do the other? As a matter of fact, right-minded Catholics have consistently and outspokenly been among the first to disavow this wicked churchman. In no journal have we read so ruthless an exposé of Coughlin as in the *Commonweal*. Now comes a statement of the case from John A. Lapp, distinguished Roman Catholic layman, which should end all confusion on this point. In a recent radio address, Mr. Lapp makes clear what all should know—that the Detroit priest, when he speaks on public questions, "is Charles Coughlin and nothing else."

> "Father Coughlin is not entitled to speak as a priest, representing the Catholic Church, either directly or by implication, or to receive any immunities as a clergyman," Mr. Lapp said. "It is well that this is so, for a Christian church which would be responsible for the recent speeches of Father Coughlin would be unworthy of its Founder."

Mr. Lapp minces no words in his further characterization of Coughlin. "His stock in trade has been from the beginning the stimulation of fears and prejudices. . . . One must suspect the source of anything he quotes. . . . He has been found guilty of shameless distortion of material. . . . A man who uses in America as his own an anti-Semitic speech of Herr Goebbels deserves the loss of the moral respect of all right-minded citizens." John A. Lapp has for years been a trusted and honored spokesman of his church. If any man can speak the mind of Rome on Father Coughlin, it is he.

THE LAW IS THE LAW

We do not believe that we are guilty of any exaggeration when we state that we regard the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the famous Mayor Hague case as the most important victory for civil liberties since the early days of the Republic. In order to appreciate what that decision involved we must remind ourselves of what had happened in Jersey City. The C. I. O. had attempted to carry on in that community an organizational campaign for labor such as it has carried on in dozens and scores of other communities in this free country. Its campaign was planned along the familiar lines of holding public meetings, distributing pamphlets and circulars, and in general exercising the constitutional rights of free speech, free press, and free assembly. Mayor Hague, bitterly opposed to labor, undertook to break up this campaign by denying to all concerned the civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution. Proclaiming "I am the law," he forbade public meetings, closed private halls and other places of assembly, seized and destroyed all printed matter, and drove out of town those interested in vindicating the rights not only of the workers but of the people generally. Mayor Hague, in other words, established a complete reign of force and violence, and impudently challenged state and nation to do anything about it. Had Mayor Hague's will prevailed, the Constitution would have been completely nullified in Hudson County and a full-fledged Hitler regime established within the frontiers of this nation. Thanks to the American Civil Liberties Union, this impudent challenge to the rights of a free people was answered, and the fight for freedom bravely joined. The battle was fought from court to court and at last carried to the Supreme Bench itself, where it was authoritatively proclaimed that not Mayor Hague but the law itself is the law, even in New Jersey. The far-reaching effects of this decision are incalculable. Never again, in any city or smallest village, can the people be denied the right of assembling in public places to discuss problems of public interest. Never again, throughout all the borders of this land, can any public official ban distribution of circulars and papers. The highest tribunal in this Republic has spoken the final word, which means that America is still free. Incidentally, in this connection, it may well be remembered that not so long ago many liberals and radicals who should have known better were joining the President in his attempt to break the power of the Supreme Court!

Jottings

For eight long, lean years the Republicans have been waiting for an issue which would restore them to the seats of power. Is it possible that this issue is now going to be presented to them by the Democrats, free gratis, in the form of the Third Term?

Never is religion in our time degraded so completely to a mere convention as in the case of the baccalaureate services at our college commencements. These graduates, most of whom have never seen the college chapel before, are not exactly hungering for the Word. They are going through a performance, like "supes" at the opera. When religion takes on again some real significance in college life, we shall take these baccalaureates seriously, but not before.

The sinking of the three submarines (will another be sunk before this paragraph is published?) reminds us of the lawyer cross-examining the witness on miracles. "If a man fell off a ten-story building and lived, wouldn't that be a miracle?" "No," said the witness, "that would be an accident." "If he fell off a second time and lived, wouldn't *that* be a miracle?" "No," was the retort, "that would be a coincidence." "But if

he fell a third time," persisted the lawyer. "That," said the witness, "would be a habit." So with submarines! There's no question of sabotage in these disasters. Submarines are simply boats that have a habit of sinking, that's all.

In following English diplomacy these days, it may be well to remember the old adage—that England loses all the battles, and wins the war!

Last year the collegiate crowning of Walt Disney gave us the greatest happiness. This year we were most delighted by the two degrees that went to Anne Lindbergh.

Vacation time again! "Jottings" will now retire until UNITY's first issue in October.

J. H. H.

Two Men of Mexico

HAROLD P. MARLEY

The history of Mexico, like that of our own democracy, has been a history of personalities, mixed in turbulent rough-and-tumble. From the time of Hidalgo, when it was the fourth largest country on the globe, down to Pancho Villa and the present, its cornucopia has not only poured out natural wealth, but a rich assortment of leaders.

Two men, both full-blooded Indians, may be taken as typical examples of the rise of the liberal spirit and its application to social life. One, Benito Juarez, the Lincoln of Mexico, was a contemporary of our Great Emancipator, also a lawyer; and, as President, the hero of a bitter Civil War which divided families but finally freed the State from the domination of the Church. The other, Lazaro Cardenas, who is at present fighting a bloodless battle of "Mexico for the Mexicans," is a Roosevelt with a Six-Year Plan for his new deal, and is just as outspoken against the exploiters of that part of the population which is ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clothed.

Both men, reared in adversity, struggled from adobe hut to palace via the governorship of their respective states. In true Lincolnian style and like the Railsplitter, their fundamental belief is that government should be *of, by* and *for* the people—not a totalitarian State of regimented puppets. Noteworthy, also, is the fact that these principles must be implemented by a loyal army of non-mercenary soldiers who fight not for booty but from loyalty to a cause. During the holy Three-Year War between conservative and liberal, which broke out following the adoption of the famous Constitution of 1857, Juarez had all the soul agony of a Lincoln, wondering if the program so unselfishly espoused would be lost in the shuffle of marching feet. And, when he finally won, he was assailed by the forces of a European coalition under the guise of a debt-collecting junket. The idea of a new-world monarchy appealed to Napoleon III and received the blessing of the Pope. Therefore, it was not long before a misinformed Hapsburg was pushed onto a shaky throne by columns of French soldiers, while the duly elected President of the Republic stood off these interlopers in his Vera Cruz stronghold.

Between the time of Juarez and Cardenas there was the same phenomenal development of Mexico which came in the United States after Lincoln—railroads, mines, oil. How familiar the story! Cardenas, like Roosevelt, has challenged the abuses of this capitalistic era without destroying it. He encouraged the rise of a strong labor movement by seeing that enabling laws were passed. Indeed, the whole question of expropriation of oil properties grew out of a labor question, viz., how much democratic control should be guaranteed the petroleum workers? The haggling over a million dollars, when 450 millions were at stake, would never have resulted in the final crackup had the oil men not insisted on the traditional laissez-faire system of hiring and firing.

Capital investment, outside of land-hogging, has been relatively safe, and extremely profitable. Two foreign telephone companies compete for the business in Mexico City. A recent article in *Fortune* states that probably only 60 per cent of the value of the 250 millions of dollars of annual exports remains in the country. It is only natural that Mexico should erect fences around industry, just as do the Fascist powers, but as they get higher and higher in this transition period, the investor gets more and more restless and calls upon his native Government to assist him through diplomacy, or the more effective economic boycott.

In spite of this outside pressure, Cardenas is strong today for the same reason that Juarez was powerful. There is a popular belief in his sincerity and honesty, and a trust in his adequacy to meet the acute problems which arise. Mexican businessmen usually confine their protests to the Rooseveltian invective: "He's going too fast." So sure is the leader of the sound base on which he stands, that he, like Juarez, extends amnesty to political prisoners and permits a freedom of criticism by a hostile press which would have deflated most Mexican presidents as flat as a tortilla. Soon after taking office, this poor peon's son issued a proclamation that all telegraph lines (Government-owned from the beginning) at a certain hour in the day should be open and free for the use of the humblest citizen who had a grievance to lodge at headquarters. Nor does he wait for this, but frequently out-tourists the tourist in his journeys to the most isolated spots to personally meet the people. These church-laden villages primarily need water and schools—a school whose only project is community service. While engineers build dams and reservoirs, young teachers risk their lives to put across the John Dewey kind of Socialist education. Twenty have been slain since the first of the year.

It is this quick-on-the-trigger temperament which makes strong personalities so important in Mexico. Vacillating men are soon swallowed up by scheming Cedillos. It took courage for Cardenas to expropriate the oil properties—risking not only his own skin but the whole of his adventurous Six-Year Plan. Once

he had taken the step, Mexico rejoiced. The graft and wordy equivocation since 1857 was once and for all settled. Cathedral bells rang out not his death knell, but burst the way for a new day in this wealth-laden, poverty-stricken country.

Whereas Juarez took great areas of land from the church (it owned about a third of the wealth) without compensation, Cardenas has offered to pay the oil companies in ten years. While the Lincoln of Mexico gave freedom to the peasant in the form of land, his contemporary in the North gave freedom to another exploited individual in the form of a useless ballot. Each refused to compensate the original owners, believing that the element of basic human justice undercut the property rights of individuals and institutions. Undoubtedly this is the way Cardenas looks at the land distribution which he is pledged to complete. The moving finger of time must decide what debts are valid obligations upon future generations, and which bonds will be redeemed.

If the Klan followed our Civil War, and if foreign intervention followed the Mexican civil war of Juarez' time, the question may well be raised, what will follow the reforms of Cardenas? Will there be a reaction which will neutralize some of the good which has been accomplished? With the end of his term of office approaching, this is the most discussed question—who and what will happen below the Rio Grande in 1939? The answer, according to Hubert Herring, chairman of the Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America, lies not in Mexico City but in Washington. If the United States will continue its Good Neighbor policy, and not economically strangle the Cardenas government, then the Six-Year plan will succeed and a stable and progressive Mexico will result. But, if not, then chaos, with a quick assumption of a Fascist government, actively supported by Japan, Germany, Italy, and—sadly, we must add England, with whom diplomatic relations are already severed.

As Lazaro Cardenas rides down Avenue Juarez from his modest home to his offices, past the marble Bellas Artes and the modern National Building, he probably thinks of his predecessor and recalls that it was the friendship of the United States which saved him in the dark days of the sixties. Buying a lottery ticket from the boys who jump on the running board at stop lights, he likely wonders what kind of Mexico these future citizens will inherit. Will their Socialist education and their happy free days be lost in the mad scramble of certain of their elders who love to ride about the parks on Sunday bepistoled in charro costume, dreaming of the good old days?

Mexican Labor Eyes the Good Neighbor

A special interview with the "John L. Lewis of Mexico"—Senor V. L. Toledano, Secretary General of the General Confederation of Labor

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

What are the impoverished people of "golden Mexico" and their more energetic leaders thinking today about their rich next-door neighbor north of the meandering Rio Grande, whose armaments are steadily mounting to Old World proportions, and whose official brows have begun to frown in stern reproof at certain social experiments and grandiose expropriations of the Mexican Government? What are they saying now about the once-genial "Good Neighbor" in Washington, and his fair-spoken promises of patience, understanding, and coöperation, after six years, in the presence of the most severe crisis in Mexican economic affairs and in Mexican-American political relations—to say nothing of dark threats from abroad—which have clouded the American horizon since the World War? Underlying economic facts that condition the currents of international psychology and relationship are more important—and obscure—verily, than what ordinary people think and say about them. Yet popular attitudes of mind, propaganda, and misunderstandings are moving facts in themselves, which sometimes alter economic events; and they are always of great weight in the skein of incident and idea which winds onward towards international life and welfare—or death and doom.

In the case of our neighbor, Mexico, the ideas and attitudes of relatively few men and newspapers determine the course of public events. The sensational and drastic action of President Lazaro Cardenas who last year decreed the nationalization, or lawful expropriation (as the Mexicans see it), of the immensely valuable British and American petroleum properties and mines, in Mexico, was precipitated by insistent pressure from the leaders of the more radical wing of the national confederation of labor. Although the decree was acclaimed enthusiastically by all the newspapers of Mexico, and crowds cheered the President whenever he appeared in public, there is no doubt that the act occasioned many difficulties and much unemployment and suffering for tens of thousands of Mexican people, especially for workers in the oil fields. It jeopardized the stability of the country and its peso, and seriously embarrassed the good neighborliness and progressive economic and political reciprocity of Mexico and the United States. While all of Latin America watched attentively the consequences, apprehensive of American anger and reprisal, the Roosevelt Administration sought to delay and circumvent the difficulty, conscious that its explicit policy of friendliness and fair play towards the nations of the American Hemisphere was being subjected to its most acid and embarrassing test.

Great resentment and powerful pressure on the part of influential private interests in this country, meanwhile, demanded effective and energetic action by the American Government to obtain restitution of the seized properties or adequate indemnity for them. Estimates of their value ranged all the way from 100 to 400 million dollars. Citizens not resident in the Capital can have little idea of what goes on behind the scenes, or of how precarious and difficult is the pathway of the honest peacemaker and the rôle of the con-

structive statesman who seeks to subordinate private economic interests to long-range considerations of national well-being while advancing the accepted foreign policies of the country and protecting its legitimate interests abroad. In the case of great private investments in foreign countries, which happen to lie in the pathway of awakening nationalisms of underprivileged or backward nations, and which can be easily, if not wisely, attacked, annulled, or expropriated—law or no law allowing it—this pathway is lined with nettles and paved with pitfalls.

Many months have passed, and although some satisfaction has been obtained from Mexico in the matter of the Mexican Government's continued expropriations of agricultural lands owned by Americans—expropriations amounting to, perhaps, fifteen million dollars in value—largely by virtue of the cordial personal relations subsisting between Mr. Sumner Welles, the Under Secretary of State, and Dr. Francisco Najera, the Mexican Ambassador at Washington—nothing final has been done to compensate the American or British petroleum interests for the loss of their great properties, which the Mexican Government is exploiting as best it can.

Several striking suggestions for reaching a constructive solution of the controversy over the Mexican expropriations of foreign-owned lands and properties have been made. These have ranged all the way from a proposal that the United States Government lend a sum as large as $100,000,000 to the Mexican Government to enable it to pay off the foreign owners of the nationalized properties on condition that the foreign companies facilitate the sale of Mexican Government petroleum throughout the world and repay the intergovernmental loan from the profits of the business, over a period of years, to a suggestion that the United States Treasury should transfer to Mexico a large sum of British Government bonds, or promissory notes, representing the unpaid British World War indebtedness to Uncle Sam, and the use of them as a means of paying off the British petroleum companies for their nationalized Mexican properties. Since over 60 per cent of the valuable foreign oil properties affected were British owned, and since the British Government itself is a very large stockholder of the principal British petroleum company operating in Mexico (the "Aguila," or Royal Dutch Shell Corporation), the British Government could hardly refuse to accept payment in its own bonds, howsoever frequently it may have defaulted upon the payment of the obligations. This astute suggestion of swapping British "I. O. U.'s" for Mexican good will and a reasonable Mexican settlement of our own claims, is too original and audacious, probably, and too downright Yankee-clever ever to be acceptable to our frequently pro-British State Department!

If we are to avoid the more serious and sordid evils of old-style financial and political imperialisms, however, and wish to cement the growing solidarity of the Western Hemisphere, it behooves us to recall that Mexico is neither the first nor the last impoverished and aspiring nation to seize upon the property and expropriate the investments of wealthy foreigners as well as some of their own more astute or fortunate citizens, in time of national emergency and exasperation. The world is witnessing similar and far more cruel conduct on the part of the German Government towards the property and rights of an allegedly alien minority. It is useful, moreover, to remember that three or four "sovereign" states of our own federation, both before and after our great Civil War, coolly and persistently defaulted in payment of their own bonds purchased and held by British investors, thereby expropriating the private property of honest citizens of a friendly foreign land; and that these honest citizens remain unpaid to this day—the Government of the United States having declared its inability to recompense them for their losses or to coerce the delinquent States. What, then, of Mexico? By contrast with that of many other countries, its record is not bad.

Believing it to be both interesting and important to know what the popular leaders of the more articulate and literate elements of the Mexican people are thinking today about the policies of the self-styled Good Neighbor in Washington, and about the future relationship of the two countries in the light of the present issues which divide the interests of some of their citizens, the present writer submitted a series of direct questions in writing to Dr. Vincente Lombardo Toledano—the "John L. Lewis of Mexico," who is Secretary General of the largest Mexican confederation of labor. Receiving from him a series of written replies, through the mediation of a personal friend resident in Mexico City, with authorization to publish them, I am glad to do so while recalling that, as the organized laboring people of Mexico think, so think the Army leaders and so acts the Mexican Government under the administration of Lazaro Cardenas. For Mexico is not a collectivized and consolidated dictatorship, like Soviet Russia; but it is an emerging democracy of labor in mine, factory, and farm, a socialized and coöperative commonwealth arising upon the ruins of a once-gleaming feudal and sacerdotal pyramid.

Labor is unquestionably in the political saddle, in Mexico, today; but not Communism in any Marxist, Stalinist, or Trotskyist sense; and there is no man on horseback dominating the scene. According to a public statement by Emilio Portes Gil, former president of the Republic and honorary chairman of the executive committee of the *Partido Nacional Revolucionario* (the united political party dedicated to the fulfillment of the social and economic aims of the historic and continuing revolution of 1910, inaugurated by Madero, the martyred orator and organizer):

> . . . there are now 688,000 organized agricultural workers in Mexico. Moreover, officials of the Mexican Federation of Labor, popularly called the C. T. M., claim 533,000 members among the industrial and other workers in cities and towns. There are about 30,000 workers organized in independent, non-affiliated unions. If these figures are not padded (and there is some question of them even in Mexican labor circles), one in every three heads of families in Mexico today is a member of some workers' economic organization. If American workers were organized on the same scale, it would mean that there would now be about 12,000,000 trade-union members in the United States.

Dr. Vincente Toledano recently said:

> A little more than a year ago, after a quarter century of discord and strife, the different factions among the rural and urban workers of Mexico put aside their differences and united in a "Popular Political Front," like the contemporary coalitions in France and Spain, for the purpose of consolidating the gains of the Revolution and advancing the aims and ideals of the new social order. The recent exile of Senor Calles, Luis Morones, and others, to the United States was felt to be a necessary step in this program, in the eyes of the rank and file of Mexican labor as well as of the leaders of the Mexican government.

The attitude of the organized, united working-

class of Mexico towards President Roosevelt and his newer Latin-American policies is therefore of great importance to all citizens of the United States. Dr. Toledano, the Secretary-General of the *Confederacion de Trabbajadores de Mexico,* is generally recognized as the chief of the socially constructive labor forces, whose ability and integrity are respected and feared by the reactionary elements of old Mexico.

One of the questions asked, to which Dr. Toledano returned a direct reply, was:

"What does Mexican Labor think of the Good Neighbor policy, as proclaimed at Washington?"

Answer: "We hope that it may work out in the literal meaning of the term. The best neighbor is one who does not interfere in another's home, even when those who occupy it live by customs different from their own. There is a biological tendency in strong individuals and countries to regard human questions in relation to one's own values; and to impose these values and customs upon others. Since the United States constitutes the one first-class power in the Western Hemisphere, the 'Good Neighbor Policy' has an added significance. A good neighbor, to repeat, is one who does not interfere in the private affairs of the home next door."

Another question was: "What is the attitude of Mexican Labor towards President Roosevelt and his New Deal?"

To this Dr. Toledano replied: "The C. T. M. considers that the attitude of President Roosevelt possesses great significance for it, in that it appears to support and justify the program and aims of the organized working masses and labor parties in all parts of the world; because it condemns, for the first time in the history of presidents of the United States, economic inequality between men—and nations—as the principal cause of the great material and moral crisis now gripping the United States and the world at large. The fight of President Roosevelt against the forces of Wall Street, as well as against the more aggressive forms of capitalistic exploitation, deserves and receives our most sincere applause, because we know that when those forces, which contribute so greatly to the poverty of their own people, cross international frontiers, they become clutches of iron that strangle in blood and shame the 'backward,' or weak and insufficiently organized countries of the Western Hemisphere.

"The New Deal, in our opinion, is a plan to mitigate some of the worst evils of the present crisis, becoming with each recurrence more difficult and devastating, that plague the present social order of the West. The plan is not a fundamental remedy, capable of destroying the causes that produce the crises, because it leaves comparatively untouched the question of private ownership and investment of capital for private profit rather than for social welfare and the commonwealth. But since it is undeniable that the large majority of the American people are not yet ready for a transition to a definitely coöperative and planned—if not nominally Socialistic—society, the interest of the masses of the American people lies where the interest of the Mexican people lies—in avoiding, or repelling, the great threat hanging over both of them at this hour,—the triumph of economic and political reaction and of the forces controlled by Wall Street, the men of the so-called Liberty League, Hearst, and the jingo journalists, whose program, if successful, would defeat and destroy the democratic rights and the hope of future well-being and security of the common American people."

To this my informant adds the interesting observation that the immediate demands of the awakened Mexican people who have found an honest and fearless leader in the person of President Lazaro Cardenas are not essentially different from the announced aims of the New Deal in the United States, save that the engineers of the latter seem to believe that Big Business is willing and able to subdue and regulate itself for the social good, with some governmental assistance and direction—whereas the Mexican labor movement thinks any such optimistic assumption and sanguine attempt is futile. Its adherents are, therefore, employing their united and recently enlarged political party to compel recalcitrant industry, particularly foreign-owned industry, to operate in a manner consistent with newer standards of social justice and public welfare, or surrender their right to operate at all. In fine, if President Roosevelt's future action and that of his cautious and frequently divided Department of State confirm and fulfill the promise of his words—and we are still ready to believe that they will—then there is no doubt that he can have the acknowledged moral leadership of the distressed and impoverished masses of the Western world, whose standard of living—if it could be raised generally even to the level of the most underprivileged third of the North American population—would absorb all of the products of the matchless industrial machine, fully operated, for many years.

Will not the democratic Sybil, presiding over some economic tripod in the White House, or elsewhere, proclaim the way to do this—and the will?

Some Impressions Gathered in Mexico

E. G.*

Whenever anyone asks me "to do an article on Mexico," I am under the impression that he has not the remotest idea what a dangerous task he is setting before one who is actually living here. If I were asked to write about some one phase of Mexico or Mexicans or Mexican life I would not feel quite so uneasy, and might by a miracle even turn out a good story. I could choose, for instance, to write about such colorful relics of barbarism as bullfights, or about such exciting and absorbing pastimes as the Mexican National Lottery and the many other State and local lotteries, or about the Mexicans' love of chile in his food which burns the roof off his mouth.

I might go into ecstasies over the Mexican climate, with its perpetual sunshine and mild, springlike weather; or about the grandeur and magic of the scenery, including three majestic, snow-capped mountains. I could present to the mind's eye the typical, colorful male and female Mexican costumes, the *charros* and

*An American resident in Mexico.—*Editor.*

chino poblanos; or I could tell of Mexico's recently excavated ancient cities in Oaxaca and Yucatán, of its awe-inspiring pyramids at Teotihuacán and other places, of its ruins and remains of ancient civilizations which once flourished on this continent; or of any one of a thousand and one other Mexican things and characteristics.

It is very easy to rhapsodize about the climate of Mexico. No doubt United Staters would be interested to know that on Christmas Day, when many of them were snowed in, a few "compañeros" and I were hiking and lolling about in woods green and beautiful under a radiant sunshine, that thousands of others spent their Christmas Day in exactly the same way, and that still more thousands were bathing on that day in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, at Veracruz, Acapulco, and other beaches along the east and west coasts of this country.

Other folks might be impressed by the fact that the churches during Christmas week were crowded to the very doors day after day and night after night; that this "heathen" who is writing these few lines actually stayed through an all-night mass at the church in the Village of Guadalupe, the most holy of the many holy spots in the Republic of Mexico.

And there are other details in the Mexican picture one might touch up, lending color to the whole scene: the many beggars, for instance, met with everywhere on the streets of Mexican towns and cities—barefooted, ragged, crippled creatures, with their wide, broad-brimmed straw hats and their inevitable serapes thrown over their shoulders.

There are many things one could say about the lotteries and bullfights and their effect upon the lives and characters of the people, about the hot chile dishes, the tamales, the tortillas, the enchaladas, and the daily dish of "frijoles" (beans), all of which are as much a part of the pattern of Mexican life as are the horribly noisy, dirty, crowded subways of the life of New York City.

But would the telling of merely these things give a true and complete picture of the Mexican scene? Perhaps, to the tourist. But to the student, the thinker, the investigator, the sincere searcher for the truth, the quiet, honest observer, who is not satisfied unless he can see beneath the surface? To him who looks not for the good and the beautiful only, nor for the bad and the ugly only? Would writing about the New York subways, and the Woolworth Building and the Rockefeller Center tell us what is New York City? Would one really know New York by merely knowing of these things? Would one not have to hear also about Tammany Hall and its corruption as well as about the Community Church; about New York's gambling dens, brothels, and the vice and crime and human misery and degradation that exist there, as well as about the gilded palaces and centers of culture and education, about the schools and universities to which thousands of working people go nightly to develop soul and mind?

But, believe it or not, it would really not be possible to "do an article on Mexico" that would give a complete picture and get away with it. That is, it would be impossible to write an article on Mexico telling the whole story of Mexico and continue to live in the country. For of all people on earth whom I have ever met, both in Europe and America, Mexicans are the most unwilling to hear about their own defects and weaknesses when pointed out by foreigners, the most unwilling to admit them, the most easily offended. It is risking one's liberty to make the slightest criticism, even of the most obvious, glaring faults, risking one's ability to remain in this country. Even for saying what I am saying here, I do not know but someone seeing it may insist that I am a "pernicious foreigner" who is here for no other purpose than to criticize Mexico, and should therefore be put on a train and shipped out of the country. And in Mexico they are not at all averse to literally picking up a pernicious foreigner wherever he happens to be, putting him on a train and shipping him out without so much as giving him an opportunity to go home and pack his trunk, or notify his family of his whereabouts, or kiss his sweetheart goodbye, and explain why he cannot marry her.

Yet verily I am not a pernicious foreigner at all in my feelings with respect to Mexico. I love this country so much and am so genuinely interested in her welfare and progress that I have already lived here many more years than I ever intended to when I first came. It is with the same affection that one criticizes the erring members of one's own family that I permit myself to make critical observations of these people among whom I make my home.

So the best I can do in this short article on Mexico is to state that Mexico is a land of extreme contrasts. Contrasts exist in every land, of course, but not to such extremes as here. One sees, for instance, the most ultra modern mode of living side by side with the most ancient, primitive conditions of life. One sees well-dressed, richly clad men and women walking the streets by the side of half-naked, barefooted, emaciated-looking Indians. There are homes that are mansions or castles on the same streets with and sometimes contiguous to veritable hovels. There are modern, up-to-date cities and ancient, primitive Indian villages, as primitive as the beginning of time. The average religious attitude here is but little short of idolatry and extreme fanaticism, and yet petty stealing, robbing, shooting, killing, and sex immorality are the order of the day, as if religion and daily going to mass are in no way related to the conduct of life. There are very few homes in Mexico in which there is not one or two religious statues or pictures, yet the number of illegitimate children in the public schools is greater than that of the legitimate. There are many highly educated, cultured people and vast masses of illiterates. One is told that there actually *are some* honest men in government posts, but one does not have to be told that there is an astounding amount of graft and corruption in government service, low places as well as high, because one rubs elbows with it at every encounter. In fact, graft and corruption run more or less through the entire fabric of Mexican life, *yet,* let a foreigner so much as *dare* hint at the graft and corruption here to any Mexican, and the latter immediately is on fire with anger, and will invariably retort that there is as much graft and corruption in the United States as in Mexico, only it takes thousands or even millions to buy a grafter in the former country whereas in the latter you can buy one with ten pesos. Which is the best proof in the world, of course, except to the blazing Mexican, that there cannot be as much graft and corruption in the United States, because very few people can pay thousands or even millions to a willing grafter. There is a noticeable tendency to courtesy on the part of the average Mexican, but an even more noticeable tendency to make promises and appointments without the slightest

intention of keeping them, and without the slightest humane consideration of the inconvenience caused the persons receiving these false promises and appointments. There are snow-capped mountains in the foreground and a scorching sun overhead.

Perhaps it is her contrasts that make Mexico so interesting and intriguing. Who knows? But it also makes one do a lot of thinking and questioning, pondering and wondering. "They are like children," I have often heard foreigners say.

Recently I met an acquaintance coming out from the church at Guadalupe. He is a Catholic and a Mexican. I am neither. When I told him that I had decided to stay for the midnight mass, he looked at me somewhat skeptically and then said: "Well, look out for your pocketbook. The man who may be next to you, praying on his knees for hours and with arms outstretched in idolatrous adoration of the Christ on the altar, will be watching constantly, through his half-closed eyes, for a chance to rob you."

I was at a mass meeting in the most beautiful *Palacio de Bellas Artes* (Palace of the Beautiful Arts). The spacious theatre was packed to standing room. Not another human being could possibly have crowded in. Hundreds outside were clamoring to get in. The Spanish ambassador, a powerful orator, was the principal speaker. Other powerful orators spoke that evening. The subject was the civil war raging in Spain.

The atmosphere was tense with emotion. The audience alive and a hundred per cent loyalist. From all corners of that immense building shouts and greetings were constantly heard: *"Viva el Comunismo," "Vivi la España Republicana," "Fuera Trotsky," "Bajo los Fascistas."* An audience of that kind, in the United States, would have contributed in the collection anywhere from three to five thousand dollars, if not more, in addition to having paid an admission fee. The beauty of the place itself, the comfortable, commodious, plush seats, above all, the *purpose* of the meeting and the magnificent speakers, were worth the most a person could give, even at a sacrifice. Yet this vast audience, for all its shouts, noise, yellings, greetings, hand clappings, and in spite of the fact that the admission was free, contributed in the collection less than two hundred pesos.

In that same beautiful *Palacio de Bellas Artes,* only a short time ago, was an audience just as big. The occasion—a protest against Germany's savage persecution of her Jewish citizens. The speaker—Vincente Lombardo Toledano, recognized Mexican labor leader. Whenever he speaks and on whatever subject, it is worth any sacrifice of time, labor, or money to hear him. The audience was aroused to a frenzy of indignation at what is going on in that benighted and barbarous land. Again the same yellings and greetings and shoutings, the same constant interruptions of the speaker with *"Vivas,"* or *"Bajos,"* the same fine fervor characteristic only of Latins, the same prolonged and wild applause. But nothing more. Not a word, neither from the speaker, the chairman, or anyone else, about a boycott of German goods, not a suggestion for some definite action that would bring Germany to her knees, that might make her cease her savage lust for blood and oblige her to behave like a civilized nation. Nothing. Nothing but oratory and shouts and noise. As if Germany will be frightened by oratory.

Typically Mexican. Lots of fervor, excitement, noise, shouts, greetings of *"Viva el Comunism," "Fuera Trotsky,"* and so on. But contribute money? Pay for your convictions? Make any real sacrifices? Do something really effective? Whoever heard of such a thing?

There is more fervor, noise, talk, and grandstand oratory in Mexico in a minute than there is in the United States in a year. In Mexico there is less intelligent organization, really effective work, giving until the giving hurts, in a year, than there is in the United States in a minute.

There are literally thousands of individuals here who call themselves and wish to be considered as anti-Fascists, Liberals, even Socialists and Communists, who have never contributed one single nickel or a red copper cent to the cause of the Spanish Government since the war in Spain began; and as for their contributing to a Jewish Cause, why, they would have to completely lose their minds to even think of doing such a thing. Yet speak to these individuals and they talk big, they are anti-Fascists, Liberals, Socialists, Communists, and everything else all rolled up in one.

Yes, in Mexico one does a lot of thinking, questioning, wondering, and pondering, and at times even a little quiet cussing. But the cussing has to be very quiet, *if you are a foreigner,* even a radical foreigner. That is why I ask you not to sign my name to this article, merely my initials. At that, I am taking a big chance!

The Common Man Speaking

I am a voice of the common man.
Degraded I am, in all lands despised,
A prey to high greed and ever a pawn
Moved by my masters watching their gains.
Capable of dignities to me still denied,
I am a voice and I sing my state.

Slow thinking, a plodder, both sullen and gay;
Dawn man, elemental in joy and my grief;
Brother of the soil, kin of the clod;
Animal, savage, child and man;
I rise from the earth; I look to the sky.
In my loins lies the past, the future, too;
The course of that future by my numbers is shaped.
I am your hope; I am your despair!

Begetter of genius, to the moron sire;
Father of the mass man, patient and dull;
Sweaty my brow, evil my smell;
Foul is my mouth, ugly my moods;
Grimly I toil, and grimly I hate;
Tilling the soil, tending machines.

Out on the street, begging your bread;
Loitering, groaning and grinning my hate;
Passion now rising, hate now expanding and
waiting!
Slowly your greeds penetrating;
Revolutions look from my eyes, alter my mien;
The tide of my woe rushes in.
Slave though I am, a man I would be;
I will battle *my* wrongs nor follow *your* flags.

Rulers beware! Take heed, and unbend;
Shaky your seats; disgorge yourselves now;
Hurricanes come, for man I will be.

Homer Lewis Sheffer.

Painting the Town

MIRIAM ZIONY

A new paint supply company had moved into town and was starting an intensive spring advertising and selling campaign.

> Young ladies who like to meet and interview people. Distribution work. Salary and commission,

was what the "help wanted" column in the local newspaper called for.

Meeting and interviewing people and asking them all sorts of questions regarding their aptitudes and interests, their resources and employment, their illnesses and education, and other even more intimate particulars pertaining to their life histories was part of my work in the social welfare and socio-economic research fields. Persuading Mrs. Jones to send Mary to the psychiatric institute and take Johnny to the eye and ear clinic; inducing Brown & Company, Inc., to wait a little longer for the next furniture installment, or to take back the worker whom they had discharged for negligence and intoxication; selling ideas to clients on the wisdom and practicality of planning the weekly household budget to meet the weekly income or the advisability of adopting better health programs have been necessary and interesting, although at times disheartening, details in the solution or mitigation of social case problems in a world of multitudinous maladjustments.

Commercial salesmanship and the business of making people buy merchandise, things which they might, or might not, need or want, whether books or vacuum cleaners or theatre tickets for a worthy benefit performance, has been something that I have always abhorred and never desired to engage in. But an extended period of unemployment and the chance of earning a little money, led me to inquire about, and accept the job—at two dollars a day and a possible 5 per cent commission.

According to the telephone directory, there were already over 150 big and little paint businesses established in the town, besides a large number of paperhangers, painters, and interior decorators, some of whom also sold painting supplies. Within a few blocks of the new entrepreneur there were at least half a dozen small dealers in paints, trying to make a living, hoping that warmer weather and the arrival of the spring housecleaning and renovating season might bring them a brief respite from depression.

A 30c can of varnish or enamel in a variety of enticing new tints reduced to 9c, or an 80c can of wax that requires no rubbing and polishing, for only 59c, are worth noticing, however, when one is planning to get busy on the floors or the woodwork or the kitchen furniture. And the personal house-to-house appeal of a nationally known concern that distributes special coupons and beautifully illustrated booklets—with the compliments of its new local director—showing attractive and colorful exterior and interior home decorations, has long ago proved to be a better means of bringing in the customers than merely hoping and waiting for them.

For several weeks I traveled around the town, ringing doorbells, handing out the complimentary booklets, displaying color charts, discoursing upon the merits of my particular brand of paints, taking down names and addresses of persons interviewed, and making notations as to their painting and decorating plans and their buying prospects.

Temporarily, I had become one of the two million salespeople who day in and day out go up and down the land advertising, canvassing, soliciting, exhorting, and expounding as though their very lives depended upon it—and economically, their lives and their living do depend upon it; who spend their energies and their talents in drumming up trade for one company or another.

There is a certain fascination to the sound of doorbells. In their ring they carry expectations—of long awaited messages, perhaps, or the possible arrival of unexpected guests—that compel the busy householder to leave important tasks and hasten to make reply. And even though they find that it is only another pestiferous salesman, it is surprising how friendly people are and how patiently and good-naturedly they will in general listen to every new sales talk.

As I went from house to house and door to door, summoning housewives from their cooking and their washing, awakening them from an afternoon nap, interrupting an important telephone conversation, taking people away from their meals, or from the bedside of a sick child, with my ring, there came to mind thoughts of the millions of unemployed who would consider themselves fortunate to have even such a job as this; and thoughts of the millions, both employed and unemployed, whose time and efforts could be put to more constructive and more satisfying use under an economic and social system where needs and resources were more purposefully planned and integrated.

And yet, I thought, how good it is to live in a town where one need not fear to ring a bell or hear it ring; where one is free to buy and sell, or not to buy and sell; where one can open, or refuse to open one's door with impunity—or even bang it shut at will in the face of unwelcome visitors without dread of reprisals at the hands of some planning bureaucrat.

Paradoxically enough, while in the dictatorial countries under planned economic government control, unemployment has been reduced and almost eliminated, general standards of living have also been reduced and the people are told that for the sake of the planning principles they must be satisfied "temporarily" with less food and clothing and other necessities, our complaint has been that too much is being produced on the farm and in the factory, that there are too many goods and services. The attainment of universal prosperity by confiscation, persecution, and regimentation is proving to be a snare and a delusion. With each new purge it has become more and more evident through the accusations and "confessions" of the proletarians and totalitarians themselves, that there may be other chains besides capitalist ones which it would be well for the workers to beware of, and that production for profits as well as for use may offer benefits not only to producers but to consumers also.

Despite its human and material waste through cutthroat competitive methods, exploitation of labor, and other innumerable faults and flaws, a profound consideration of the values in our enormous and intricate economic and industrial mechanism should give pause to the economic theorists who argue that only a few

powerful trusts and corporations run the country anyway and that government ownership and the abolition of private profits are essential before all the people can be adequately fed and clothed and housed; to the dictatorial aspirants of the left or the right, who think that industry can function properly only under their orders and restrictions; and even to the proponents of legislation that may benefit one group without due reflection as to the effects of such legislation upon other groups or eventually upon the country as a whole.

Control of the national wealth, we are told, is concentrated in the hands of "sixty families and 200 corporations"; and we are living in an age of mass production. But there are still six million and more, big and little, individual and corporate owner-operators of factories and farms, shops and stores and other business undertakings—over three million of whom are registered as employers of the 42 million workers who are enrolled to date under the Social Security Act—without whose initiative and enterprise the wheels of our productive and distributive system would be far more clogged, the number of unemployed even greater, and the real wealth and the national income much lower than it is today.

A mere reading of the latest reports, published in 1937, by the United States Department of Commerce and the Bureau of the Census in the *Census of Business for 1935,* is sufficient to impress one with the vastness and complexity of the system and the number of employers and employees, citizens and alien residents alike, who take part in the creation and distribution of goods and services in every city and county and state, without benefit of identification cards or political maneuverings.

In 1935, 8,454,918 paid employees were engaged in the manufacturing industry alone, drawing a total annual income of $9,836,031,000. (The *Census of Manufactures* for the same year records 7,378,845 factory wage earners, exclusive of salaried employees, in a total of 169,111 manufacturing, printing and publishing establishments under 81,522 proprietors and firm members, but this does not include manufacturing establishments doing less than $5,000 worth of business a year.)

In the construction industry there were an additional 75,047 establishments with 69,193 active proprietors, 409,137 employees, who earned $470,275,000 for the year; 52,125 or 69.5 per cent of the construction establishments did less than $10,000 of work each for the year, and 11,547 or 15.4 per cent were in the $10,000 to $25,000 category.

Types of construction include building, highway, and other forms of general contracting as well as carpentry, concreting, electrical heating and plumbing, roofing, masonry, ornamental iron work, painting and paper-hanging, plastering, wrecking and demolishing, etc., in the special trade contracting field.

In connection with wholesale distribution there are listed a total of 176,756 establishments with 97,225 active proprietors and an average of 1,277,717 employees. Net sales for the year amounted to $42,802,913,000 and the annual payroll was $2,049,483,000. "There were 125,032 organizations of separate ownership engaged in wholesaling during 1935. Of this number, 118,804 operated only one establishment each; 2,761 maintained two establishments; 2,030 maintained from three to five each, or a total of 7,296; while 1,437 organizations each with more than five establishments accounted for a total of 38,698 wholesale places of business." In addition there were "6,436 commission bulk tank (gasoline) stations . . . owned by 15 multi-unit wholesalers but which [were] operated independently by commission agents with a proprietary interest. . ."

In the retail trade there were in the United States the same year, a total of 1,653,961 stores operated by 1,511,734 active proprietors and firm members devoting a major portion of their time to the enterprise, doing a business of $33,161,276,000, and providing work for an average of 3,961,478 full and part-time employees on an annual payroll of $3,623,289,000.

Eighty-nine per cent, or 1,474,149 of all the retail establishments, were classified as "independent" stores with 85.8 per cent, or 1,419,855 of them under single store ownership. There were 1,471,938 active proprietors and firm members connected with the independent stores, which employed an average of 2,838,801 full and part-time workers who were paid a total of $2,558,615,000 in wages, and which made 73.1 per cent of all retail sales for the year.

Retail *chains,* defined as "organizations operating more than three centrally merchandised retail stores in the same general kind of business," operated 127,482, or less than 8 per cent of all retail stores; made, however, 22.8 per cent or $7,550,186,000 worth of all retail sales; and paid out $910,569,000 to 963,636 employees.

Types of retail business include: grocery stores (without meat), combination stores (groceries and meat), beer and liquor stores, motor vehicle dealers, accessories-tire-battery dealers, filling stations, department stores, variety stores, men's clothing and furnishings stores, family clothing stores, women's ready-to-wear stores, shoe stores, furniture stores, household appliances-radio stores, radio dealers, lumber and building material dealers, hardware stores and implement dealers, restaurants and eating places, drinking places, cigar stores and cigar stands, fuel and ice dealers, drug stores with fountain, drug stores without fountain, hay-grain and feed stores, farm and garden supply stores, jewelry stores, etc.

It is interesting to note that "approximately 40 per cent of all retail stores [were] operated entirely by proprietors and their families who receive[d] no stated compensation." "Chains accounted for one-third of total sales in only six kinds of [retail] business. They did the largest proportion of total sales in variety stores, accounting for 90.8 per cent. In automobile accessories-tire-battery dealers and in shoe stores, chains did one-half of the total business. Of the total sales for cigar stores and cigar stands chain store sales were 35.8 per cent; 39.1 in combination stores (groceries and meats), and 38.2 in grocery stores (without meats)." "Independents accounted for more than two-thirds of total sales in 17 out of the 26 kinds of business shown above."

Retail "stores with sales of $50,000 or more, although representing only 7.2 per cent of all stores, accounted for 53.3 per cent of total sales." But here, too, the little businessman still plays a prominent part in supplying the merchandise we buy, with as high as 44.5 per cent of all retail businesses, outside of chains and mail order units, making less than $5,000 worth of sales annually.

Service enterprises, of which there are over 3,000 varieties in the United States, include: *Personal Services,* such as barbers and beauty shops, cleaning and dyeing, laundries, photograph studios, shoe repairing, funeral directors and embalmers, etc. *Business Services,* such as adjustment and credit bureaus and collection agencies, auctioneers, billboard advertising service, blue-

printing and photostat laboratories, coin-operated machine rental and repair service, court reporting and public stenographic agencies, dental laboratories, employment agencies, disinfecting and exterminating agencies, freight forwarders and custom house brokers, photo-finishing laboratories, sign painting shops, ticket agents and brokers and travel bureaus, title and abstract companies, window cleaning services, etc. *Repair Services and Custom Industries,* such as automotive repairs and services (excluding general repair garages), automobile laundries, paint shops, radiator shops, rental service storage garages, automobile top and body repair shops, battery and ignition repair shops, parking lots, tire repair shops, etc. *Other Repair Services* (except apparel and shoes) including armature rewinding shops, blacksmith shops, electrical appliance repair shops, harness and leather goods repair shops, locksmith and gunsmith shops, musical instrument repair shops, piano and organ tuning and repair, radio repair shops, refrigerator service and repair shops, saw and tool sharpening and repair, typewriter repair shops, upholstery and furniture repair shops, watch, clock and jewelry repair shops, etc. *Custom Industries,* such as cabinet-making shops (including wood working), cider mills and presses, grist mills, hemstitching, embroidery, and buttonholing shops, machine shops, mattress renovating and repair shops, molasses, sorghum and syrup mills, printing and publishing shops, sawmills and planing mills, threshing, corn shelling, haybaling and other agricultural services, tinsmith shops, welding shops, etc. *Miscellaneous Services,* such as landscape gardening and tree surgery services, livery stables, etc.

In 1935, there were 580,840 active proprietors and 634,232 employees on a payroll of $567,517,000, connected with service establishments which, according to the *Census of Business,* are mostly "small businesses, more than half of which are operated solely by proprietors and members of their families, the volume of their receipts not justifying the employment of paid personnel." Seventy-five per cent of the 574,708 establishments included in the Census, reported annual receipts of less than $3,000 and 203,078 or 35.3 per cent even less than $1,000 per year.

Agricultural products, according to the *Census of Agriculture for 1935,* have been raised on 6,812,350 farms by a total of 3,899,091 farmers *who owned all the land which they operated* and an additional 2,865,-155 tenant farmers working under 48,104 managers.

Thousands of private banking and insurance agencies; private hotels and real estate agencies; private transportation, telephone and telegraph services; private schools and colleges; private amusement and recreational groups, etc., provide jobs for additional millions of workers, and add to the national wealth and well-being.

Aside from the development of terrific armament programs, the essential achievement in dictatorial countries—Communist, Fascist and Nazi—has been the putting to work of the unemployed on large-scale public works programs and the expansion of road building, housing construction, and better health and recreation and educational facilities for the masses of people.

But have we not here in this country, under the emergency-work programs of the last few years, also created jobs for several million jobless and provided much needed roads and homes, schools and playgrounds, nursing and medical care, etc., for young and old on an unprecedented scale? And have we not done these things without first liquidating the enterprises of private individuals and groups or confiscating what has already been built through private industry and initiative, *without concentration camps,* as President Roosevelt has said?

In continuing committees and in local and national meetings, businessmen are becoming more and more conscious of the total economic situation and of their responsibilities to the public as well as their own privileges and profits. Also, it is being realized more clearly today than ever before that taking away from the rich, from those that have, does not necessarily give more to the poor; but that to the extent to which business and government and labor are able and willing to recognize one another's values and functions and limitations, and to work jointly instead of in opposition, will the national and international welfare, collectively and individually, be best advanced.

There are still in the United States an estimated 10 to 12 million men and women who are able and willing to work if they were only given the chance to do so. Private industry has been appealed to again and again and numerous publicity committees and campaigns have been organized to interest employers in creating additional jobs. But private industry has not been able to take upon itself the responsibility of hiring 10 or 12 million additional workers.

Wishful thinking about a restoration of "confidence," through reduction of taxes and the elimination of government in business, will not solve the problem today any more than it did in 1930 and 1931, before the New Deal experiments were initiated.

It is quite obvious that if the unemployed only had more purchasing power, more goods and services would be purchased, more workers would be needed to create and distribute the additional goods and services, and both labor and industry would enjoy an increased prosperity.

There have been a number of proposals for further distribution of funds to non-workers and increased subsidizing of surplus commodities and idleness. Now a staggering rearmament program, against which even United States Chamber of Commerce spokesmen warned us but recently as a false hope, is being accepted and consciously, or unconsciously, being looked forward to as the road to recovery.

An additional appropriation of five hundred million or so, for war materials is a necessary insurance against war, and also a way of giving people jobs, we are persuading ourselves; for putting men and women to work on an expanded program of Public Works, however, there is no more money available. But do we have to make bombs and bullets before our farmers can sell their surplus wheat and butter? Must warplanes and battleships take precedence over schools and scholarships? Must those who need shoes first be provided with gas masks? Is there nothing better than a war emergency for 10,000 "chosen" manufacturing plants to wait and hope for before they can return to production at full capacity?

Rather, can we not help to increase business and the standard of living, the national wealth and culture, by *making work* for a few more million jobless on the thousands of approved local, state, and national projects and projects not yet approved or provided with loans and grants under the P.W.A., W.P.A., and other government agencies; by further stimulating private construction and trade and employment and creating,

both at home and abroad, markets for what are now surplus products, and for new products as well, in the process of creating more houses for those that need them, more hospitals and health centers where they are still lacking, more schools and playgrounds and swimming pools, more opportunities for self expression, for intellectual and artistic appreciation in public forums and theatre projects, in arts and crafts classes and music centers, more vocational and guidance centers for the untrained and the maladjusted, more "talking books" for the blind—made by the blind—more worthy ways of living?

At the Congressional hearing on Unemployment before which prominent business and financial leaders were called for suggestions some months ago, a well-known financier was quoted as having said that he would give half his personal wealth to be able to find a solution to the recession and the unemployment question. A former chairman of the United States Steel Corporation has been finding a new rôle for himself in trying to help the refugees of political and religious intolerance and persecution in other lands. May it not be that the real solution of the problems of our refugees from unemployment and the eradication of the economic causes of the growing racial and religious intolerance in this country will show the way towards relief for those other refugees and for those countries whose intolerant nationalistic ideologies and upheavals have been brought on through the general world stress and maladjustment?

The Study Table

The Bible and the Common Man

JOHN WYCLIF AND THE ENGLISH BIBLE. *By Melvin M. Cammack. 289 pp. New York: American Tract Society. $1.75.*

THE BOOK OF A THOUSAND TONGUES. *Edited by Eric M. North. 386 pp. New York: Harper and Brothers. $2.50.*

These two books about Bible translations should be read together; one introduces and supplements the other. The Bible has now been translated into more than a thousand languages and dialects, eighty-nine in the American continent. Practically every tribe has been reached by a translation of the Bible, which, in many instances, has been the means of reducing the language or dialect to print. The history of Bible translations is one of perennial interest, and books on the subject will continually be written.

Mr. Cammack has attempted to trace out the work of John Wyclif and his relation to the English Bible. Wyclif, a contemporary of Chaucer, is usually credited with being the father of the Bible in modern English. It was he who inspired the common people with a desire to know the Bible, the authority for their religion, so far as the common people were concerned. Wyclif was a great humanitarian as well as a great Christian Humanist. As master of Balliol College, he commanded the respect of the scholars of his day; as founder of the Lollard Movement he gained the love of the people. Nor was he alone in his stand against institutional religion. William of Occam taught the supremacy of the Bible over that of the institution; Grosseteste, the great Humanist, remonstrated against the temporal claims of the Church; but Marsiglio of Padua taught as early as 1324 that "the sovereignty of the State rested with the people, that the people were the real rulers and judges, and that the king was their representative. Wyclif applied this principle to the Church as well as to the State." Marsiglio in Italy and Wyclif in England were forerunners of democracy and the principle of separation of Church and State. During all this struggle over the theory of the State and the temporal power of the Church, the Bible became the great agency which promoted the idea of democracy. When the common people wrested from the Church the right to the Bible, democracy began. Wyclif in England was the first champion in this struggle. Mr. Cammack has endeavored to show in his scholarly book just how much of the Bible Wyclif handed on in translation to the great martyr to the English Bible, Tyndale.

Dr. North, General Secretary of the American Bible Society, has produced a unique and valuable book. He has given an account of the thousand translations of the Bible, with samples of the languages and their script. Here one sees what the Bible in Sanskrit, Chinese, Bugotu, and all the rest looks like. For those interested in languages this is a treasure trove. How many persons can name fifty languages? How many have seen the script of a thousand? These translations make one of the major achievements of modern times.

CHARLES A. HAWLEY

Rise, Ye Men

Rise, ye men, and strike for freedom,
This the day of your release.
See, the dawn at last is breaking,
In our time shall we find peace.
Right is with us, God is for us,
Who can stay our triumph then?
Save the people, save the people,
We are not dumb brutes, but men.

From the farm and from the workshop
We are come to claim our own.
Lords of greed must yield their scepter,
Truth is on the people's throne.
Strive for justice, strike for judgment,
All your liberties defend.
Save the people, save the people,
Right must conquer in the end.

Shall we see our children perish
On our own, our fathers' soil?
Shall we serve vain lords of pleasure
With but curses for our toil?
God be with us, God defend us,
We shall never yield the fight.
Save the people, save the people,
Strike for freedom, and for right.

THOMAS CURTIS CLARK.

Correspondence

Roosevelt and the Third Term

Editor of UNITY:

Assuming that the majority—at least—of your readers are liberal and progressive, it follows that they are interested in the effort of certain groups—labor, radical, and other—to convince President Roosevelt that he ought to announce, 'ere long, his willingness to accept a third nomination for the office of chief executive. It is known in Washington that several members of the cabinet are now urging him to run again, despite the tradition against third terms in the White House. And now we learn from well-informed journalists that Postmaster Farley, admittedly a shrewd and popular politician, is satisfied, as the result of his trans-continental trip largely, that Roosevelt can have the 1940 nomination if he wants it, or feels that he should seek it.

The situation being what it is, the writer begs to submit to sober-minded liberals that it is their moral duty and political privilege to support the movement for a third term for Roosevelt. There is no better or abler leader in sight *if* the sound and permanent features of the New Deal are to be preserved and gradually extended and improved. A dark horse cannot win in 1940 on the Democratic ticket. The Democratic party will have to defend the New Deal philosophy and program in next year's campaign; it will have no alternative course. No one can do that job more persuasively than Roosevelt. If he cannot defeat the Republican candidate, surely no one else has the slightest chance of doing so. And the Republican candidate of 1940 *must be* defeated. He may profess to be liberal, and his platform may promise to continue the New Deal policy, on the whole, while endeavoring to reduce the cost of that policy in terms of taxes and borrowing. But every intelligent American knows that a Republican administration is bound to be a reactionary administration—for two years at least, that is, until the voters get another inning and elect a new Congress!

The Republican leaders are Tory at heart; they will be financed by Tories, anti-labor corporations, speculators, and Bourbons of all sorts. They will have to redeem some of their pledges of economy and efficiency, and that will mean sales taxes instead of social taxation based on ability to pay, doles instead of jobs for the unemployed, abandonment of public works, reactionary changes in the Wagner Labor-Relations act, encouragement to stock gambling and renewed exploitation of the small and credulous investors.

These abuses must be prevented. The reëlection of Roosevelt would prevent them. Reactionary policies would spell disaster, even if they gave us a short-lived and unhealthy boom. We cannot, as a nation, *afford* reaction in industry, business, or politics.

As to that sacred cow, the tradition against third terms, it is simply ridiculous to consider it as a serious objection to a third nomination for Roosevelt. Our age has little respect for old slogans and dead formulas. We are skeptical and critical. We demand good, solid, substantial reasons for, or against, any proposed step. The tradition in question was reasonable enough for a period; it has lost its *raison d'être.* The talk of dictatorship should alarm no one. Roosevelt will be the same man, intellectually and morally, in 1941 that he has been in the last six years. He is moderate, democratic, level-headed, and simple. He will not abolish Congress or the independent judiciary. He will not suspend the Bill of Rights. He will not imprison the plutocratic or Tory editors of the big daily newspapers. We shall all be safe and free during his third term—as safe and as free as we are now. Who can really think otherwise?

I repeat, it is up to liberals and progressives to push and help the third-term movement in the Democratic party. Roosevelt must be drafted.

VICTOR S. YARROS.

Chicago, Illinois.

Questions "Return to Jesus"

Editor of UNITY:

In John Cournos' book *Letter to Jews and Christians,* there is an appeal to "side with Jesus as against Fascism and Communism." Cournos declares that Jesus represents the concrete, realistic person we need to defend our human values.

Against this type of thinking it is probable that Communism or Fascism will win. Both of them actually attack the problems of the day. Therefore, they are alive and they can be felt, heard, and seen by the multitudes who are looking for just such a demonstration. These two creeds have a grasp on *the present* in time.

In desperate times every appeal for a return to Jesus is another gain for Communism or Fascism because victory does not lie with *those who run away from the present.* A religious spirit can be read into the solving of today's hard problems by those who actually wrestle with them.

CARL PETERSON.

Chicago, Illinois.

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page* 130)

because its limits are so circumscribed as to make government only a party to the enterprise and not the dominant controlling element."

Among the signers of the statement were:

Rev. John P. Boland, chairman, New York State Labor Relations Board, Buffalo.

Rev. Allan K. Chalmers, Broadway Tabernacle Church, New York.

Rev. Raymond S. Clancy, executive secretary, Archdiocesan Labor Institute, Detroit.

Dr. Everett R. Clinchy, director, National Conference of Christians and Jews, New York; Rabbi J. X. Cohen, president, New York Board of Jewish Ministers, New York.

Rev. James A. Crain, executive secretary, Department of Social Action, Disciples of Christ, Indianapolis, Ind.

Rabbi Israel Goldstein, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, New York.

Rabbi Sidney E. Goldstein, associate rabbi, Free Synagogue, New York.

Right Rev. Mgr. Francis J. Haas, dean, School of Social Science, Catholic University of America, Washington.

John Haynes Holmes, New York.

Dr. Paul Hutchinson, managing editor, The Christian Century, Chicago.

Rabbi Edward L. Israel, Har Sinai Congregation, Baltimore.

Rev. F. Ernest Johnson, executive secretary, Department of Research and Education, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, New York.

Rev. Edgar DeWitt Jones, Detroit.

Dr. Benson Y. Landis, associate secretary, Department of Research and Education, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, New York.

Rabbi Morris S. Lazaron, Baltimore.

Bishop Francis J. McConnell, New York.

Rev. R. A. McGowan, assistant director, Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington.

Rev. Charles C. Miltner, dean, College of Arts and Letters, University of Notre Dame.

Rev. Joseph N. Moody, Cathedral College, New York.

Rev. James Myers, industrial secretary, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, New York.

Right Rev. Thomas J. O'Dwyer, general director, Catholic Welfare Bureau, Archdiocese of Los Angeles.

Right Rev. Edward L. Parsons, San Francisco.

Rev. Almon R. Pepper, Department of Social Relations, Episcopal Church, New York.

Right Rev. Mgr. John A. Ryan, Professor of Social Ethics, Catholic University, Washington.

Rabbi Hyman J. Schachtel, West End Synagogue, New York.

Rev. Charles E. Schaeffer, chairman, Commission on Christian Social Action, Evangelical and Reformed Church, Philadelphia.

Rev. Robert W. Searle, general secretary, Greater New York Federation of Churches, New York.

Dr. Guy Emery Shipler, editor, The Churchman, New York.

Rev. Ralph W. Sockman, Christ Church, New York.

Rabbi Elias L. Solomon, New York.

Rev. Edward E. Swanstrom, associate director, Brooklyn Catholic Charities, Brooklyn.

Rev. Paul F. Tanner, secretary for Catholic Action, Archdiocese of Milwaukee.

Rev. Worth M. Tippy, president, Church Conference of Social Work, New York.

Rev. Ernest F. Tittle, Evanston, Ill.

Rev. Charles C. Webber, executive and field secretary of the Methodist Federation for Social Service, New York.